

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 6. By the foregoing amendment Claims 1-10 are amended. Claims 5 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-13 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed May 23, 2005, the Examiner objected to the title for not being descriptive. The title has been amended responsive to the objection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the objection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,625,327 to Carroll et al. (hereinafter, "Carroll"). Claims 1-4 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,945,884 to Nakatsuka (hereinafter, "Nakatsuka") in view of Carroll and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,230,396 to Boelke (hereinafter, "Boelke"). The Applicants hereby traverse the rejections, as follows.

I. Rejection of Claim 1-3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Amended Claim 1 recites in part, an oscillator comprising an inductor being isolated from the DC voltage. Carroll, in Figure 11, shows that the inductor L1 is supplied with the DC voltage Vcc via the diode D3 and the resistor R23. Thus, the

oscillation output signal includes the DC component based on the DC voltage V_{cc} . In contrast, amended Claim 1, includes the limitation “the inductor being isolated from the DC voltage”. The present invention does not have any DC component superimposed on the AC oscillation signal, but includes the AC component only.

Another feature of Claim 1 is a drive circuit that feeds back the resonant signal to the resonant circuit via a first node of the inductor. Carroll does not suggest or disclose a drive circuit that feeds back the resonant signal to the resonant circuit via a first node of the inductor. Figure 11 of Carroll shows that the intermediate node of the inductor L1 is not used to make the feedback loop but, is used to make a connection with the micro-controller.

In summary, Carroll lacks both an inductor being isolated from the DC voltage and a drive circuit that feeds back the resonant signal to the resonant circuit via a first node of the inductor. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited prior art. As claim 1, is allowable, Applicants submit that claims 2-3, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable over the cited prior art.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakatsuka in view of Carroll and Boelke. Applicants respectfully submit that Nakatsuka does not disclose or teach an inductor having a first and a second node, as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, the inductor 21 of Nakatsuka

does not have any node or terminal for the output via which the oscillation signal is output besides a node or a terminal making the feedback loop.

In addition, Carroll lacks both the elements of an inductor being isolated from the DC voltage and a drive circuit that feeds back the resonant signal to the resonant circuit via a first node of the inductor, as discussed above with regard to the rejection of claims 1-3.

In summary, Nakatsuka does not disclose an inductor having a first node and a second node, and, and in addition, Carroll does not disclose either the element of an inductor being isolated from the DC voltage or a drive circuit that feeds back the resonant signal to the resonant circuit via a first node of the inductor. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1, is allowable over the cited prior art. As claim 1 is allowable, Applicants submit that claims 2-4 and 7-13, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable.


As noted above, Claims 5 and 6 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have rewritten Claims 5 and 6 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, Applicants assert that Claims 5 and 6 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4 and 7-13, now pending patentability, distinguish the present invention from the cited references. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have rewritten Claims 5 and 6 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicants assert that claims 5 and 6 are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, with reference to attorney docket number 025720-00019.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles M. Marmelstein
Registration No. 25,895

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395